2

*3* 

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14 15

HYDE & SWIGART San Diego, California

16

v.

17 18

19

20

21

222324

2526

27

28

Robert L. Hyde, Esq. (SBN: 227183)

bob@westcoastlitigation.com

Hyde & Swigart

411 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 301

San Diego, CA 92108-3551.

Telephone: (619) 233-7770 Facsimile: (619) 297-1022

Attorneys for the Plaintiff

North Shore Agency, Inc. and

Sherman's Travel,

# ED

09 DEC -9 AM 10: 30

CLERK. U.S. DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

γ:

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Seyed Kazerounian, Case Number:

Defendants.

THE STATE OF THE S

Plaintiff, Complaint For Damages

**Jury Trial Demanded** 

### Introduction

The United States Congress has found abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors, and has determined that abusive debt collection practices contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy. Congress wrote the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. (hereinafter "FDCPA"), to eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt

OFIGINAL

- collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses.
- 2. The California legislature has determined that the banking and credit system and grantors of credit to consumers are dependent upon the collection of just and owing debts and that unfair or deceptive collection practices undermine the public confidence that is essential to the continued functioning of the banking and credit system and sound extensions of credit to consumers. The Legislature has further determined that there is a need to ensure that debt collectors exercise this responsibility with fairness, honesty and due regard for the debtor's rights and that debt collectors must be prohibited from engaging in unfair or deceptive acts or practices.
- 3. Seyed Kazerounian, (Plaintiff), through Plaintiff's attorneys, brings this action to challenge the actions of North Shore Agency, Inc., ("Defendant North Shore"), and Sherman's Travel ("Defendant Sherman") with regard to attempts by Defendants to unlawfully and abusively collect a debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff, and this conduct caused Plaintiff damages.
- 4. Plaintiff makes these allegations on information and belief, with the exception of those allegations that pertain to a plaintiff, or to a plaintiff's counsel, which Plaintiff alleges on personal knowledge.
- 5. While many violations are described below with specificity, this Complaint alleges violations of the statutes cited in their entirety.
- 6. Unless otherwise stated, Plaintiff alleges that any violations by Defendant were knowing and intentional, and that Defendant did not maintain procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such violation.

26 //

//

27 //

28 //

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 7. Jurisdiction of this Court arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 15 U.S.C. § 1692(k), and 28 U.S.C. § 1367 for supplemental state claims.
- 8. This action arises out of Defendant's violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA") and the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, California Civil Code §§ 1788-1788.32 ("RFDCPA").
- 9. Because Defendants do business within the State of California, personal jurisdiction is established.
- 10. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.

### **PARTIES**

- 11. Plaintiff is a natural person who resides in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California.
- 12. Defendant North Shore is located in the City of Melville, the County of Nassau, and the State of New York.
- 13. Defendant Sherman's Travel is an entity of unknown formation operating from Boulder, Colorado.
- 14. Plaintiff is obligated or allegedly obligated to pay a debt, and is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 15. Defendants are persons who uses an instrumentality of interstate commerce or the mails in a business the principal purpose of which is the collection of debts, or who regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly, debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another and is therefore a debt collector as that phrase is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).
- 16. Plaintiff is a natural person from whom a debt collector sought to collect a consumer debt which was due and owing or alleged to be due and owing from Plaintiff, and is a "debtor" as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(h).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Defendants, in the ordinary course of business, regularly, on behalf of 17. himself, herself, or others, engages in debt collection as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(b), is therefore a debt collector as that term is defined by California Civil Code § 1788.2(c).
- This case involves money, property or their equivalent, due or owing or 18. alleged to be due or owing from a natural person by reason of a consumer credit transaction. As such, this action arises out of a consumer debt and "consumer credit" as those terms are defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(f).

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- At all times relevant to this matter, Plaintiff was an individual residing within 19. the State of California.
- At all times relevant, Defendants conducted business within the State of 20. California.
- Sometime before August 1, 2009, Plaintiff is alleged to have incurred certain 21. financial obligations.
- These financial obligations were primarily for personal, family or household 22. purposes and are therefore a "debt" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(5).
- These alleged obligations were money, property, or their equivalent, which is 23. due or owing, or alleged to be due or owing, from a natural person to another person and are therefore a "debt" as that term is defined by California Civil Code §1788.2(d), and a "consumer debt" as that term is defined by California Civil Code §1788.2(f).
- Sometime thereafter, but before August 1, 2009, Plaintiff allegedly fell behind 24. in the payments allegedly owed on the alleged debt. Plaintiff currently takes no position as to the validity of this alleged debt.
- Subsequently, but before August 1, 2009, the alleged debt was assigned, 25. placed, or otherwise transferred, to Defendant for collection.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- Sometime prior to August 7, 2009, Defendant Sherman contacted Plaintiff and 26. demanded payment on an alleged debt concerning a magazine subscription.
- On August 7, 2009, Plaintiff attempted to find contact information for 27. Defendant Sherman, to inform Defendant Sherman that Plaintiff did not incur this alleged debt, filed a police report as he was a victim of identity theft, and that Sherman was instructed to stop collecting on the disputed account. This was communicated to Sherman through an email.
- On or about September 24, 2009, Defendant Sherman sent, and Plaintiff 28. received, a dunning letter from Defendant Sherman to Plaintiff. By sending this communication after Defendant Sheman was notified in writing that Defendant Sherman cease further communication with the Plaintiff in a manner consistent with the requirements in 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(c), Defendant Sherman violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(c). Because this action violated the language in 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(c), Defendant also violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.
- On or about October 21, 2009, Defendant Sherman sent, and Plaintiff 29. received, a dunning letter from Defendant Sherman to Plaintiff. By sending this communication after Defendant Sheman was notified in writing that Defendant Sherman cease further communication with the Plaintiff in a manner consistent with the requirements in 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(c), Defendant Sherman violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(c). Because this action violated the language in 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(c), Defendant also violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.
- Despite having received written communication that Plaintiff did not incur the 30. alleged debt and refused to pay, Defendant Sherman knowingly and willfully sent this disputed debt to a third party collection agency, North Shore Agency, Inc. Defendant North Shore then began to collect on behalf of Defendant

- 1 2
- 3 4
- 5
- 6 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11 12
- 13
- 14
  - 16

- 17
- 18 19
- 20 21
- 22 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

- Sherman in light of Plaintiff's written request to stop all collection communications.
- On or about December 3, 2009, Defendant North Shore sent, and Plaintiff 31. received, a dunning letter from Defendant North Shore to Plaintiff. sending this communication after Defendant Sherman was notified in writing that Defendant Sherman cease further communication with the Plaintiff in a manner consistent with the requirements in 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(c), Defendant North Shore violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(c). Because this action violated the language in 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(c), Defendant North Shore also violated Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.

### COUNT I

### FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (FDCPA) 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 ET SEQ.

### AGAINST DEFENDANT NORTH SHORE

- Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other 32. paragraphs.
- The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations 33. of the FDCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the abovecited provisions of the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq.
- As a result of each and every violation of the FDCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to 34. any actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1); statutory damages in an amount up to \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A); and, reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) from Defendant.
- //

//

- //
- //

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### **COUNT II**

## ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (RFDCPA)

### CAL. CIV. CODE §§ 1788-1788.32

#### AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 35. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.
- 36. The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations of the RFDCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of the RFDCPA, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1788-1788.32
- 37. As a result of each and every violation of the FDCPA, Plaintiff is entitled to any actual damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a); statutory damages for a knowing or willful violation in the amount up to \$1,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b); and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c) from Defendant.

### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants, and Plaintiff be awarded damages from Defendants, as follows:

- An award of actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against each Defendant;
- An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. \$ 1692k(a)(2)(A) against each Defendant;
- An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against each Defendant;
- An award of actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 1788.30(a) against each Defendant;
- An award of statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b) against each Defendant;

to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(c) against each Defendant.

America, Plaintiff is entitled to, and demands, a trial by jury.

38.

Date: 12/2/09

San Diego, California 

HYDE & SWIGART

Hyde & Swigart

An award of costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees, pursuant

Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Case 3:09-cv-02747-BEQUILL COVERNHEETed 12/09/09 Page 9 of 10

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contains the informatio

the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Seyed Kazerounian	DEFENDANTS North Shore Agency, Inc. and Sherman's Travel,
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego	County of Residence Millioted Befehlind: 34ssau
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  IN NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMN ATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE  LAND INVOLVED. THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Hyde & Swigart 411 Camino Del Rio South Suite 301, San Diego, CA 92108	Attorneys (If Known) OP CV 2747 BEN DEN BLM
619.233.7770 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	II. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
U.S. Government X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only)  and One Box for Defendani)  PTF DEF  Citizen of This State
2 U.S. Government	Citizen of Another State
$\mathbb{R}^{N}$	Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6 6 6 Foreign Country
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	
CONTRACT    110 Insurance   PERSONAL INJURY   362 Personal Injury   362 Personal Injury   Med. Malpractice   Liability   365 Personal Injury   Med. Malpractice   Salander   330 Assault, Libel & Product Liability   368 Asbestos Personal Injury   368 Asbestos Personal   369 Asbestos Personal	690 Other
V. ORIGIN  ☐ 2 Removed from Appellate Court  ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court  ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened  ☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify)  ☐ 6 Multidistrict ☐ 7 Magistrate Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION  Cite the U.S.C. \$ 1692 et seq.  Brief description of cause: FDCPA	filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: 75,000 JURY DEMAND: Yes ONo
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE	DOCKET NUMBER
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTO  12/08/09 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	DRNEY OF RECORD
RECEIPT # 8/11 AMOUNT 350,00 APPLYING IFP	JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

· Court Name: USDC California Southern

Division: 3

Receipt Number: CASO08111 Cashier ID: msweaney

Transaction Date: 12/09/2009

Payer Name: HYDE AND SWIGART ATTY AT LAW

CIVIL FILING FEE

For: KAZEROUNIAN V NORTH SHORE Case/Party: D-CAS-3-09-CV-002747-001

Amount: \$350.00

CHECK

Check/Money Order Num: 3578 Amt Tendered: \$350.00

Total Due: \$350.00 Total Tendered: \$350.00 Change Amt: \$0.00

There will be a fee of \$45.00 charged for any returned check.